

**MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING
OF
GREENSBORO PLANNING BOARD
AUGUST 17, 2005**

The Greensboro Planning Board met in regular session on Wednesday, August 17, 2005 at 2:05 p.m., in the City Council Chambers, 2nd floor, Melvin Municipal Office Building. Board members present were Vice Chair Dick Hall, Tim Bryson, Michael Fox, Julius Koonce, J.P. McIntyre and John Rhodes. Planning staff members present were Dick Hails, Planning Director, Alec MacIntosh, Ricky Hurley and Heidi Galanti.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE JULY 11, 2005 PLANNING BOARD-ZONING COMMISSION JOINT MEETING AND JULY 20, 2005 PLANNING BOARD REGULAR MEETING.

Mr. McIntyre moved approval of each set of minutes as written, seconded by Mr. Bryson. The Board voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Hall, Bryson, Fox, Koonce, McIntyre, Rhodes. Nays: None.)

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

A. ORDINANCE AMENDING TABLE 30-5-3-1, PARKING REQUIREMENTS, OF THE GREENSBORO DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE TO MODIFY THE MINIMUM NUMBER OF OFF-STREET PARKING SPACES FOR MEDICAL AND RELATED OFFICES. (RECOMMENDED)

Mr. Hails said that about a year ago the City revised its standards on parking, including those for dental and medical facilities, which were based more on square footage than on the number of employees. Recently a citizen approached them regarding a medical facility, stating that there was more parking provided than needed. Staff brought forth some guidelines they had recently looked at and felt comfortable with, so they were offering those up for consideration by the Board.

At the public hearing, Jim Marshall, 4905 Plateau Court, said he was the developer of Church Street Medical (Phase I) across Church Street from Moses Cone. When the amendments to the parking requirements were made about a year ago, they were modified all the way through, except for medical. In the 70,000-square-foot first phase, parking was to code, which was 358 parking spaces. On the busiest day of the week (Monday), they have an excess of 100 parking spaces in that parking deck, with 99 percent building occupancy. For the 50,000-square-foot Phase II, the present requirement is 250 additional spaces. A general office building would require only about 133 spaces. With a small building, one space per 200 square feet (five spaces per 1,000), is a good ratio. As the building increases in size, the ratio you have to provide really should come down.

Mr. McIntyre moved to recommend the amendment to City Council, seconded by Mr. Koonce. The Board voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Hall, Bryson, Fox, Koonce, McIntyre, Rhodes. Nays: None.)

B. RESOLUTION CLOSING MCADOO AVENUE FROM EAST LEE STREET NORTHWARD FOR A CENTERLINE DISTANCE OF APPROXIMATELY 78 FEET. (RECOMMENDED)

Mr. MacIntosh said this street dates from the late 1800's. The section petitioned for closing used to be paved, but the pavement has been removed for at least 35 years and this section is no longer used for vehicular travel. It would be unsafe to repave this section and connect it to East Lee Street, because the connection would be at the end of the ramp from Murrow Boulevard. The street closing petition has been signed by Southside Neighborhood, LLC, owner of 100% of the abutting property. There are public water, sanitary sewer, and storm sewer lines in this street. Twenty-foot easements will be retained over the first

two until no longer needed for public service, and a 15-foot easement over the other. A preliminary plat proposing townhouses in this area has been approved. The Technical Review Committee (TRC) felt circumstances here allow the City to make the two required determinations for a street closing; therefore, the TRC recommended the closing.

There were no speakers at the public hearing, but Southside Neighborhood developer Nate Bowman was present to answer any questions the Board might have.

Mr. Bryson moved to recommend the street closing to City Council, seconded by Mr. Koonce. The Board voted 5-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Hall, Bryson, Fox, Koonce, McIntyre. Nays: Rhodes.)

C. ORDINANCE CHANGING THE NAME OF OLD TREYBROOKE DRIVE, FROM RANDLEMAN ROAD EASTWARD TO THE WESTERN LINE OF THE ELMSLEY SQUARE SUBDIVISION, TO WEST ELMSLEY DRIVE. (RECOMMENDED)

Mr. MacIntosh stated that Old Treybrooke Drive was dedicated in 1998 and 1999 as a continuous alignment from Randleman Road eastward to South Elm-Eugene Street. The developer of this street acquired additional land to the south, reaching to the proposed interchange at S. Elm-Eugene Street and the new I-85. Once that property was zoned for commercial use, it became apparent that it would be far preferable for the major traffic flow from Randleman Road to the new I-85 interchange to run on a continuous alignment going through the commercial development instead of through the Wynnemere single-family subdivision along the eastern part of Old Treybrooke Drive. The Elmsley Square commercial subdivision plat proposed such a street, named West Elmsley Drive. It is now paved, and it and the western section of Old Treybrooke Drive now form a continuous alignment. There are no properties addressed on that section. The eastern portion of Old Treybrooke Drive is now a separate travel way, which intersects with the main travel way. The TRC recommended the street name change.

There were no speakers at the public hearing.

Mr. McIntyre moved to recommend the street name change to City Council, seconded by Mr. Bryson. The Board voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Hall, Bryson, Fox, Koonce, McIntyre, Rhodes. Nays: None.)

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ANNUAL REPORT.

Cameron Cooke, 100 Wedgedale Avenue, Chairman of the Monitoring Committee of Connections 2025, the City's Comprehensive Plan, pointed out in this report the list of all the projects and their status. The staff was intense about implementation and from the Monitoring Committee's perspective things were going well. They see a great deal of coordination work and they were very pleased with the progress that had been made in implementing the Plan.

Heidi Galanti briefly went over the summary of the activity in Year Two, the processed Plan Amendments that had occurred and some of the goals for next year.

Mr. Hails said he thought their biggest single challenge in implementing the Plan was to be able to achieve more mixed-use development than we have had in the past. Twenty-two percent of the Generalized Future Land Use Map (GFLUM) was classified as needing to be mixed use of one type or another and 13 activity centers and six regional transit stations also were called for to be mixed use, higher density activity areas. Most developers by nature are single use developers and it was a definite education process in trying to get folks to give it a try in more and more locations.

A second area very important in implementing the Plan was trying to modify the water and sewer policies

and the service boundary. There is a new proposal on that laid out a month or two back. The County is in the process of evaluating that and giving the City their comments. Ed Kitchen gave the Council the challenge of adopting a new policy and map no later than January of next year.

A third major challenge was the coordination of numerous downtown area design and planning efforts, paying close attention to detail for streetscape, buildings, streetlights, street trees and all those other things that have to work together to have an attractive and functional downtown. City Council had asked them to move forward on a number of those things. Council also asked staff to carry out a plan for the Cedar Street area in the northwest part of downtown.

The fourth challenge was trying to overhaul and bring up to speed some of the capital facility planning staff as to what needs to be done in order to support the growth called for in the Comprehensive Plan. The Comp Plan has two major growth challenges; high-quality growth at the fringe outlying area (primarily within the green line, but outside the city limits) and more and higher quality development in infill areas that exist in communities, particularly the older neighborhoods in and around downtown.

There also was a mandated planned sunset clause for the Monitoring Committee of the Comp Plan. Its dissolution was called for next spring, and the Planning Board will become the permanent oversight group.

Mr. Fox said he encouraged staff as they went forward in looking at the Comp Plan and in the LDO rewrite to really look at the mixed-use issue and the definitions. He knew this Board had struggled and he knew the Zoning Commission had struggled also to define what was "mixed use." He thought one of the primary questions that came up was, "Does it all have to be on one parcel or was it an area?" Perhaps staff could look to see if there was some sort of delineation they could make on size of parcel.

Mr. Hails said Council had asked staff to draft some guidelines along those lines. Staff has a rough draft that addresses the exact issues that Mr. Fox was talking about and it was going through the various departments for consideration. It will be coming to the Planning Board in perhaps October or November.

PRELIMINARY PLAT - GRAMERCY PARK WEST – APPEAL OF TRC DENIAL OF REQUEST FOR MODIFICATION OF STREET IMPROVEMENT REQUIREMENTS ALONG CASTLETON ROAD.
(APPROVED)

Mr. MacIntosh said the developer requested a modification of the street improvement requirements so as not to be required to widen the Castleton Road frontage with curb and gutter. Castleton Road is a ribbon-paved street in the Kingsbury Estates subdivision. The Development Ordinance provides three possible grounds for approval of a modification. Today's request is based on the first grounds, Equal or Better Performance: a finding that equal or better performance in furtherance of the purposes of the Ordinance will result from the alternate standards portrayed on the plan.

Charlie Melvin, Esq., 300 North Greene Street, represented the developer. He explained the developer's reasoning, that they feel just to go in and interject 600 feet of widening with curb and gutter, with the rest of the street remaining ribbon paving, would not only look strange but could potentially be somewhat of a safety hazard.

Mr. Fox moved that the Board approve the modification request, seconded by Mr. Bryson.

Mr. Fox said he felt this Board should employ common sense as often as possible and he thought approving this request would accomplish that.

Vice Chair Hall said he agreed with Mr. Fox. He thought Attorney Melvin brought up a very good public safety point for not widening this very short length of Castleton Road. He also thought it might create

environmental concerns with storm water runoff.

The Board voted 5-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Hall, Bryson, Fox, Koonce, Rhodes. Nays: McIntyre.)

Mr. Hails added that it was important for staff to balance equity and consistency. If there was one thing they did not want to be accused of it was treating people differently. He observed that the Board appeared to desire more ability under the Development Ordinance to take neighborhood context into consideration.

ANNEXATION PETITIONS:

A. ORDINANCE ANNEXING PROPERTY OF CHRIST COVENANT CHURCH, SOUTH OF GLENDALE DRIVE AND WEST OF US HIGHWAY 220 SOUTH – 36.553-ACRE CONTIGUOUS ANNEXATION. (RECOMMENDED)

Mr. MacIntosh said the petitioned-for property abuts the primary city limits on its north side. The petitioner's property extends inside the city limits, fronting on Glendale Drive. The property is within the Tier 1 Growth Area (0-10 years) on the Growth Strategy Map in the Comprehensive Plan. There are several houses on the property now, mostly on the part inside the city limits. The property is proposed for development with a church, church school, and perhaps other church-related uses. A 12-inch water line is in Glendale Drive, and an 8-inch sewer line runs across the southern part of the property. Other City services to this annexation would involve traveling only a short distance beyond the already-annexed properties along Glendale Drive. The TRC recommended the annexation.

Charlie Melvin, petitioner's attorney, was present to answer any questions.

Mr. Rhodes moved to recommend this annexation to City Council, seconded by Mr. Bryson. The Board voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Hall, Bryson, Fox, Koonce, McIntyre, Rhodes. Nays: None.)

B. ORDINANCE ANNEXING PROPERTIES OF TWIN OAKS ENTERPRISES, INC.; RAOUL M. TURCOT; ALLEN G. FOGLEMAN; JAMES M. FOGLEMAN, JR.; DAVID G. CLARK; DANIEL W. VADEN; AND THOMAS K. AND TERESA I. WARD ON HILLTOP ROAD AND SHIMER DRIVE – 34.614-ACRE CONTIGUOUS ANNEXATION. (RECOMMENDED)

Mr. MacIntosh said this property is immediately west of the northern part of Adams Farm, which is inside the primary city limits. The property is in the Tier 1 Growth Area in the Comprehensive Plan. The eastern part of the property is occupied by the Twin Oaks par 3 golf course, and there were several houses on the part farther west. The zoning applied for was for multifamily development with up to 553 units. Water service is to be provided by extending a 12-inch City water line in Hilltop Road westward from where it now ends several hundred feet to the east. There is an 8-inch City sewer line running north-south through the west side of this property. Fire service can be provided to this property with moderate difficulty. The first responding company would be a contracted rural fire department about 2 miles away, and the second and third responding stations are City stations about 3 miles away. Other City services would be provided to this annexation in the same manner as already provided to previously annexed property just to the east. The TRC recommended the annexation.

Henry Isaacson, petitioner's attorney, was present to answer any questions.

Mr. Bryson moved to recommend this annexation to City Council, seconded by Mr. Rhodes. The Board voted 5-0-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Hall, Bryson, Koonce, McIntyre, Rhodes. Nays: None. Abstain: Fox.)

ITEMS FROM THE DEPARTMENT:**A. REQUEST TO CALL A PUBLIC HEARING FOR SEPTEMBER 21 MEETING ON CHANGING THE NAME OF GIRBAUD COURT TO CARDINAL HEALTH COURT.**

Tom Twitty, 3008 Maple Branch Drive, High Point, of Cardinal Health said their firm has a significant investment in North Carolina and has occupied this property since 1998. They bought the facility because of the concentration of their business in this area, as well as the ability for future expansion to the north. They had grown three-fold since they had been in this facility. Their request was just to associate the street with their name.

Vice Chair Hall observed that the September 21 meeting already seemed to have a long agenda, whereupon the Board called a public hearing on this name change for October 19.

B. LAND DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE PROJECT.

Ms. Galanti talked about the project team working on the Land Development Ordinance rewrite, the project goals, an overview of the rewrite project itself and the current status of where they were. There will be three teams working on it most frequently: Citizens Advisory Team, appointed by the City Manager; Internal Staff Team and City Council.

She went over the project goals, including: to create a user-friendly organization and format; to create a document easy to use by all, clear and concise as possible; to accommodate new development patterns they were seeing; to streamline approvals, and especially to make it easy to do the right thing; and to address issues raised by the community. They wanted to try to remove barriers to the goals they were trying to achieve.

Ms. Galanti said they had already heard some concerns that this meant the whole city would be rezoned. They are not saying that some rezoning will not need to happen, but they do not see it was a widespread rezoning of the entire city. There was a call for condensing some of the residential zoning districts. If that comes to pass, the zoning map will be modified to reflect those new districts. This would also apply to new or modified mixed-use districts.

Mr. Hails said this Board's input would be sought throughout this process. For that reason, as well as others, it is important that the Board feel that they understand and have had input into this as the project moves along.

Mr. Koonce suggested putting Ms. Galanti's Power Point presentation on the web, with a voice-over. She said she could look into that. She said it was always very difficult to get the public engaged and keep them engaged, especially in a project that was very technical. Staff would continue to try to encourage public participation and feedback. Staff was ready to take public input at any time and forward it on to the consultants.

Mr. Bryson asked that staff look at specific guidelines as to how single-family property may be used, such as how many vehicles could be parked there. Some now have two or three cars, a boat and a trailer. All of this makes an eyesore for the community.

Ms. Galanti said the future ordinance on the website would be an interactive document, loaded with search engines and different ways you can search. It will be user-friendly.

Mr. Hails noted that there are a number of candidates proposed to be brought into the Ordinance that now

reside in separate sections of the City Code, such as stormwater.

Mr. Hails said streamlining was probably the single comment they heard the most. Make the Ordinance easier to use, make the procedures easier to use, and there was no question that was going to be a major focus throughout the process. However, a caution; they had been getting other input as well that we should be taking a new look at some of our standards and in some cases taking a different approach or raising the standards.

C. ADVISORY THAT THE SEPTEMBER 21 JOINT MEETING WILL BE A VERY BUSY ONE, WITH 7 PAIRED COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND ZONING MAP AMENDMENTS.

Mr. Hails said in order to manage the Board's work load, they were going to hope for a limited size agenda for the regular Planning Board agenda that will follow the Joint Meeting. Staff was wondering if the Board might want to consider picking a set time for the regular Planning Board meeting to start and perhaps taking a dinner break between the adjournment of the joint meeting and the starting of the regular meeting, staff could advertise that the regular meeting would start at 7 o'clock (or at the conclusion of the joint meeting if it ran past 7:00 o'clock).

Mr. Bryson asked if the Planning Board meeting could start at 1 o'clock that day.

Mr. Hails said that was a possibility, but if the meeting were not completed by 2 o'clock, they would have to stop then and resume the regular meeting at the end of the joint meeting. Because of logistical problems with that, he suggested that the regular meeting start before 1:00 p.m. Mr. Hails said they were locked into 2 o'clock for the joint meeting due to broadcasting.

Mr. Bryson asked if the Board could meet in the Plaza Level Conference Room. Mr. Hails said that might be a possibility.

Vice Chair Hall said the September 21 regular Board meeting would start at 1 o'clock or, if necessary, be moved back to 12:30 p.m.

Mr. Hails said if the Board meeting were not over by 1:45, the Board might have to adjourn and pick back up after the joint meeting.

* * * * *

There being no further business before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 4:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Richard W. Hails, AICP
Planning Director

RWH/ts.ps